

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION

MORESIA BROWN HAMILTON,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR  
GENERAL, ET AL.,

*Defendants.*

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Civil Action No. 3:22-CV-0649-X-BH

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND  
RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

The United States Magistrate Judge made findings, conclusions, and a recommendation in this case. [Doc. 36]. Plaintiff Moresia Brown Hamilton sued her former employer, the Texas Office of Inspector General, her former supervisor, and the current Inspector General for Texas Health and Human Services, alleging discrimination, wrongful termination, breach of contract, and intentional infliction of emotional distress. The Magistrate Judge concluded that Hamilton failed to exhaust her administrative remedies before filing suit and accordingly recommends that the Court dismiss without prejudice Hamilton's Title VII claims. Further, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Court decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Hamilton's state-law claims and, accordingly, dismiss without prejudice those claims as well.

Hamilton filed two objections. [Docs. 37 & 38]. Liberally construed, the first

appears to argue that the Magistrate Judge failed to follow proper procedure or act ethically. It then appears to reiterate Hamilton's original arguments from her complaint. The second objection states that Hamilton is "being used for experiment[ation]" by the Federal Aviation Administration, which "is allowing airplane[s] to hov[er] over the bridge shelter[,] shocking [her] body on a daily basi[s]." <sup>1</sup> It further notes that Hamilton is unable to access a portal to obtain retirement benefits from her previous employment, as well as other benefits.

Neither objection addresses the Magistrate Judge's finding that Hamilton failed to exhaust her administrative remedies before filing suit, and neither objection argues that the Court should exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Hamilton's state-law claims. Accordingly, the Court **OVERRULES** Hamilton's objections.

The District Court reviewed *de novo* those portions of the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation to which objection was made, and reviewed the remaining proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation for plain error. Finding none, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge. The Court **DISMISSES WITHOUT PREJUDICE** Hamilton's claims.

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 17th day of July, 2023.



---

BRANTLEY STARR  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Doc. 38 at 2.